#### Message

From: Calvino, Maria Soledad [Calvino.Maria@epa.gov]

**Sent**: 5/6/2019 4:49:29 PM

To: 'Amy Brownell' [amy.brownell@sfdph.org]; 'Bill Franklin' [william.d.franklin@navy.mil]; 'Dale Schornack'

[dale.schornack@cdph.ca.gov]; 'juanita.bacey@dtsc.ca.gov'; 'McKinney, Kasheica (CII)'

[kasheica.mckinney@sfgov.org]; 'Rachael Kagan' [Rachael.kagan@sfdph.org]; 'Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ,

BRAC PMO' [derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil]

CC: LEE, LILY [LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV]; Sanchez, Yolanda [Sanchez.Yolanda@epa.gov]

**Subject**: RE: EPA responses to inside EPA/KQED inquiries

My apologies. I forgot to include our follow-up response to the Inside EPA reporter from last week. Please see below.

# May 1, 2019

# Inside EPA, Suzanne Yohannan

I heard that EPA last week sent out an additional response to the Navy on these matters. Any chance I could get a copy of it from you?

### Response:

On April 25, we sent a letter to the Navy with our comments on the Navy's November 2, 2018, draft final *Parcel G Removal Site Evaluation Work Plan* for the Hunters Point Naval Shipyard. It has been posted at our website: https://semspub.epa.gov/work/09/100017209.pdf.

#### Soledad Calvino

Press Officer | Office of Public Affairs U.S. Environmental Protection Agency | Region 9 <u>calvino.maria@epa.gov</u> Office 415.972.3512 | Mobile 415.697.6289

From: Calvino, Maria Soledad

Sent: Monday, May 06, 2019 9:30 AM

**To:** 'Amy Brownell' <amy.brownell@sfdph.org>; 'Bill Franklin' <william.d.franklin@navy.mil>; 'Dale Schornack' <dale.schornack@cdph.ca.gov>; 'juanita.bacey@dtsc.ca.gov'; 'McKinney, Kasheica (CII)'

<kasheica.mckinney@sfgov.org>; 'Rachael Kagan' <Rachael.kagan@sfdph.org>; 'Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO' <derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil>

Cc: LEE, LILY <LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV>; Sanchez, Yolanda <Sanchez.Yolanda@epa.gov>

**Subject:** EPA responses to inside EPA/KQED inquiries

# Hi folks,

Here are the responses we sent to inside EPA a couple weeks ago. I have not seen her story posted online yet. We also sent a short statement to KQED regarding the independent UC Berkeley/SF study (below the Inside EPA response). If you've had any recent press inquiries, we would appreciate seeing your final responses after you've sent them out.

Thank you!

# Inside EPA Inquiry, Suzanne Yohannan

Could you tell me if the Navy and EPA have corresponded in the last 3 months on the issues over cleanup and the reexamination of the site given the falsified data that was used there? Are there any current disagreements between EPA and the Navy over these? If there is correspondence, could I obtain copies of it?

A. Yes – EPA has been coordinating with the Navy. On December 28, 2018, EPA sent the Navy two letters with comments on its *Building Radiation Survey Data Initial Evaluation Report* and the *Draft Radiological Data* 

Evaluation Findings Report for Parcel C Soil. Those letters can be found at:

https://semspub.epa.gov/work/09/100016258.pdf and https://semspub.epa.gov/work/09/100016259.pdf.

On December 13, 2018, EPA sent the Navy additional comments on its *Parcel G Removal Site Evaluation Work Plan* (Work Plan). This letter is attached and will soon be posted on EPA's Hunters Point Naval Shipyard website. This *Work Plan* is a reexamination of the areas in Parcel G where Tetra Tech EC Inc. conducted previous radiological work. The Navy will test and clean up, if necessary, soil and existing buildings in Parcel G.

On March 27, 2019, EPA responded to a letter from the Navy dated March 15, 2019, about the process for addressing the site's *Five-Year Review* and the *Work Plan*. On April 11, 2019, EPA sent the Navy a letter that outlined a proposed path forward for these two documents. Specifically, it outlines a path forward to finalize the Parcel G *Work Plan* in phases to strategically move forward with the field rework in a manner that is transparent to the public and allows public comment. The above letters are attached and will soon be posted to the EPA's Hunters Point Naval Shipyard website. Please contact Bill Franklin (619-524-5433 or william.d.franklin@navy.mil) with the Navy for its letter.

In the fall, your predecessor, Nahal Mogharabi, told me in an email response to questions that the Navy was in the process of evaluating existing radiological cleanup standards using the current EPA PRG Calculator. Could you tell me if the Navy has gotten back to you on this evaluation?

A. The Navy is doing its *Five-Year Review* of Hunters Point Naval Shipyard. As required by the Superfund law, this important process will assess whether current remedies and remedial goals documented in the Records of Decision (RODs) continue to protect human health and the environment. EPA's Preliminary Remedial Goal (PRG) Calculator is a tool to assess the protectiveness of current remedies that is consistent with long-established Superfund regulations and guidance.

On September 21, 2018, EPA sent the Navy comments on its July 9, 2018, draft *Five-Year Review* report, which did not include draft PRG Calculator assessments. That letter can be found here: <a href="https://semspub.epa.gov/work/09/100010568.pdf">https://semspub.epa.gov/work/09/100010568.pdf</a>. Since then, we have had deliberative discussions with the Navy about its draft PRG Calculator assessments. EPA's March 27, 2019, response letter to the Navy also addressed this issue.

We recommend that you contact the Navy regarding its letter and for further questions about its PRG Calculator assessments.

---

# **KQED Inquiry, Anna Sturla**

I'm reporting on the Hunter's Point Shipyard clean-up. There will be independent testing by UC Berkeley and UC San Francisco. Does the EPA have any comment?

## Response:

EPA first learned about this in Mayor London Breed's *State of the City* address in January 2019. We look forward to learning more from the City/County of San Francisco about the scope of this independent review team.

### Soledad Calvino

Press Officer | Office of Public Affairs
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency | Region 9
<u>calvino.maria@epa.gov</u>
Office 415.972.3512 | Mobile 415.697.6289